Housing

ELDERLY RESIDENTS IN ONTARIO

86-02350/

ELDERLY RESIDENTS IN ONTARIO:

THEIR CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION

AND THEIR INTEREST IN VARIOUS HOUSING OPTIONS

Minister for Senior Citizens Affairs
Seniors Secretariat
September, 1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is part of a series on the USCO project. The study has involved a variety of individuals, groups and government departments at many levels. The eclectic nature of the study necessitated a variety of resources and it is apparent that the study has benefitted from such support.

A special thank you to the United Senior Citizens of Ontario, specifically to their Research Task Force. They conceived the initial idea and provided assistance in the field co-ordination. Reg Screen and Joyce King (USCO past President and President respectively) must be singled out for their dedication and consistent and continuous support.

Thanks are due to New Horizons of Health and Welfare, Canada. They provided the USCO with the grant to fund the project. The Income Security Branch of Health and Welfare Canada, must also be remembered for the provision of the Old Age Security data base from which the sample was drawn.

One hundred and twelve volunteers were recruited to do the interviews. Many thanks to these individuals who contributed so generously of their time.

The project began under the direction of Anna Rose Spina in the former Program Development Branch of the Ontario Ministry of Health. Stephen Newroth served as the project co-ordinator to the completion of the fieldwork. Merle Anne Ridley was my co-worker during the fieldwork and the initial stages of analysis. She also assisted me with writing the papers on the methodology, income group differences and rural-urban differences.

Anne Madigan, formerly with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, co-ordinated the fieldwork in the rural areas.

I am very grateful to the Provincial Secretariat for Social Development for funding the analysis and report writing stages. Their support has been extremely significant. Particular thanks to the Inter-Ministry Steering Committee with whom I am working: John Nywening, (Chairperson) and David Kennedy, Seniors Secretariat; George Hough, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing; Dorothy Singer, Ministry of Community and Social Services; Joan McCalla and John Thorpe, Ministry of Transportation and Communications; and Esta Wall, Ministry of Health.

My many thanks to Millie Oake for her careful typing of this manuscript.

Finally, this study could never have been accomplished without the co-operation of the 846 persons whom we interviewed. I only hope that this study sensitively and accurately represents their experience.

Arlene Hoffman, Ph.D.
Research Consultant

SUMMARY

The subject of this paper is the housing situation and preferences of the 846 persons who were interviewed for the USCO survey. Under consideration are the respondents' housing type, living mates, satisfaction with current housing, and interest in a variety of housing options.

The findings of the study revealed that the majority (67%) of respondents owned the residence within which they lived and that the majority (72%) lived in houses. Nine percent of the respondents resided in apartments for senior citizens. The respondents who resided in houses differed from those who resided in apartments or other types of housing by their age, sex, marital status and income. The respondents most likely to reside in houses were between the ages of 62 to 74, male, married, and with monthly incomes above $999.

Over two-thirds (70%) of the respondents lived with other persons and the majority (84%) of these individuals lived with one other person. Eighty-one percent (n=474) of the persons living with others lived with spouses; nineteen percent lived with children; four percent lived with siblings; four percent lived with other relatives and one percent lived with friends.

The persons who lived alone were distinguished from those who lived with others by the fact that they were residents of urban areas more frequently than rural areas, were slightly older (a mean age of 75 compared to a mean age of 73 for the persons living with others) and had lower monthly incomes.

The respondents were asked whether their residence was too large, too far from services, too far from family, too far from friends or too far from transportation. More than 80% of the respondents indicated that their residence did not fall into any of these categories.

A very small proportion (5%) of the respondents indicated plans to move in the future and of those who did, the majority said their reasons for moving was the difficulty they had maintaining their home. Forty percent of the persons with plans to move said they would be moving into a senior citizens apartment complex.

The respondents were asked to project into the future and consider the type of housing they would be interested in should they have difficulty caring for their needs. They were presented with seven housing options. Fifty-seven percent indicated an interest in staying home with community services to assist, 47% wanted to move into a housing project where some services are available, 45% showed a desire in moving into a home for elderly persons, 44% said they were interested in staying home with family to assist, 36% indicated an interest in staying home with friends to assist, 16% revealed an interest in moving in with members of the family, and 3% said they were interested in moving in with friends.

The respondents expressed least interest in relying upon family members or friends for assistance, whether it be staying at home and receiving assistance from them, or moving in with them. Even though family and friends provided the respondents with the bulk of assistance, the respondents indicated that should they require more assistance, they would prefer to receive the assistance from formal services rather than from family and friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

SUMMARY ii

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. THE CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION OF THE RESPONDENTS... 1

3. INTEREST IN VARIOUS HOUSING OPTIONS..... 3

4. CONCLUSION..... 6

APPENDICES

Tables..... 9
List of Other Papers in USCO Series..... 35
Glossary..... 37
References..... 42

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Age Group Of Respondents By Housing Type (Number And Percentage)	9
2	Sex Of Respondents By Housing Type (Number And Percentage)	10
3	Marital Status Of Respondents By Housing Type (Number And Percentage)	11
4	Monthly Income Of Respondents By Housing Type (Number And Percentage)	12
5	Monthly Income Of Respondents By Whether They Owned Or Rented Their Residence	13
6	Housing Type And Ownership Of Respondents By Whether They Lived Alone, With A Spouse Or With Others	14
7	Total Monthly Income Of Respondents By Whether They Lived Alone With A Spouse Or With Others	15
8	Age Group Of Respondents By Whether They Lived Alone Or With Others (Number And Percentage)	16
9	Marital Status Of Respondents By Whether They Lived Alone Or With Others (Number And Percentage)	17
10	Responses Of Respondents To Question: Is Your Residence (Number And Percentage)	18
11	Number And Percentage Of Respondents By Their Expressed Interest In Various Types Of Housing (Number And Percentage)	19
12	Age Of Respondents By Interest Expressed In Moving In With Family Members (Number And Percentage)	20
13	Monthly Income Reported By Respondents By Their Interest In Moving In With Members Of Their Family (Number And Percentage)	21
14	Frequency With Which Respondents Were Visited By Family Members By Their Interest In Moving In With Members Of Their Family (Number And Percentage)	22

Table		Page
15	Marital Status Of The Respondents By Their Interest In Moving In With Friends (Number And Percentage)	23
16	Present Housing Type Of Respondents By Their Interest In Moving Into Supportive Housing Arrangement (Number And Percentage)	24
17	Age Group Of Respondents By Interest In Moving Into A Supportive Housing Arrangement (Number And Percentage)	25
18	Marital Status Of Respondents By Their Interest In Moving Into A Supportive Housing Arrangement (Number And Percentage)	26
19	Requests For Additional Assistance Of the Respondents By Their Interest In Moving Into A Supportive Housing Arrangement (Number And Percentage)	27
20	Housing Type Of Respondents By Their Interest In Staying Home With Community Services To Assist (Number And Percentage)	28
21	Income Of Respondents By Their Interest In Staying At Home With Community Services To Assist (Number And Percentage)	29
22	Requests For Additional Assistance Of Respondents By Their Interest In Staying Home With Community Services To Assist (Number And Percentage)	30
23	Frequency With Which Respondents Were Visited By Friends By Their Interest In Staying Home With Friends To Assist (Number And Percentage)	31
24	Living Arrangements Of Respondents By Their Interest In Staying Home With Family Members To Assist (Number And Percentage)	32
25	Frequency Of Respondents' Phone Contact With Family Members By Their Interest In Staying Home With Family Members To Assist (Number And Percentage)	33
26	Frequency Of The Respondents' Visits From Family Members By Their Interest In Staying Home With Family Members To Assist (Number And Percentage)	34

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is part of a series on the findings of the United Senior Citizens of Ontario survey.[1] The principal objective of the survey was to systematically examine the living situation of elderly persons who reside in the community and outside of institutional settings. In this survey a scientific random sample of 846 persons was interviewed from eight areas across the Province. These areas include five urban centres: Brockville, Penetanguishene, Sault Ste. Marie, Toronto and Windsor, and three rural communities: Athens, Bruce Mines and Cookstown.

The purpose of this paper is to consider the current housing situation of the 846 respondents and the type of housing situation they would be interested in should they find it difficult to care for their own needs. Essential to this examination is a delineation of both the characteristics of the persons who live in differing housing environments and the characteristics of the persons who express interest in various housing alternatives. An underlying assumption of this inquiry is that an understanding of the housing or shelter requirements of older persons necessitates an understanding of the community, the family and the requirements these individuals have for assistance.

2. THE CURRENT HOUSING SITUATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

At the time of the interview, the majority of respondents (72%, n=595) resided in houses. Just over one-quarter (27%, n=225) lived in apartments and one percent (n=11) were housed in boarding accommodations or rented rooms. Nine percent (n=76) of the respondents resided in apartments designated for senior citizens.

The type of housing within which the respondents resided varied by age, sex, marital status and income. Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents within each age group resided in houses. Comparing age groups, the persons most likely to reside in houses were between the ages of 62 to 74 and least likely to fall between the ages of 75 to 84. Men were more likely to live in houses than women. Table 2 illustrates the thirteen percentage point difference between the number of men (79%, n=277) residing in houses and the number of women (66%, n=312) in houses. Married persons lived in houses more often than unmarried persons. Eighty-six percent (n=400) of the married respondents compared to 53% (n=194) of the unmarried respondents were house dwellers. Refer to Table 3.

---

1 Refer to Appendix for a list of other papers in this series.

The majority of respondents within each income bracket resided in houses. However, the probability of residing in a house increased as income increased. Eighty percent (n=242) of the persons whose monthly income exceeded $999 resided in houses compared to just over sixty percent (61%, n=130) of the persons whose income fell below $600. [1] Refer to Table 4.

Of the total sample, 67% (n=569) owned their residences. It is noteworthy that as the income of the respondents increased, the likelihood of residential ownership increased as well. Table 5 illustrates that 80% (n=240) of the persons whose monthly income exceeded $999 owned their residence compared to 57% (n=100) of persons whose monthly income fell below $600.

The majority (70%, n=593) of persons interviewed lived with other persons. Less than one-third (30%, n=253) lived on their own. Most (84%, n=491) of those who did not live alone lived with one other person. Eight percent (n=49) lived with two persons and eight percent (n=43) lived with three or more persons.

Eighty-one percent (n=474) of those who did not live alone lived with their spouse; close to one-fifth (19%, n=113) lived with two children; four percent (n=25) lived with siblings; four percent (n=32) lived with other relatives and one percent (n=8) lived with friends. Sixteen percent (n=92) lived with a combination of persons.

Of those who resided with others [2], the majority (83%, n=109) resided in houses. Seventeen percent (n=23) lived in apartments. House dwellers (94%, n=102) were more likely than apartment dwellers (9%, n=2) to own their residence.

Among the respondents who lived alone, 44% (n=108) lived in houses and 56% (n=140) lived in apartments. Almost all (99%, n=107) of the house dwellers owned their residence. By contrast, six percent (n=8) of those in apartments were owners. Refer to Table 6.

The respondents who lived alone had significantly lower incomes than the respondents who lived with spouses or others. Table 7 illustrates that of the persons who lived alone 53% (n=127) had monthly incomes below $600. Of those who lived with spouses, eight percent (n=32) fell into this income category.

---

1 On July 1, 1982, when this survey was conducted, the federal and provincial governments guaranteed the following total payments through the Old Age Security, Guaranteed Income Supplement and GAINS-A programs: $529.29 for single seniors and $1,003.28 for married seniors.

2 Others is defined as friends, family members, paid help or acquaintances. If the respondent is living with a spouse and one or more persons, he/she is included in the other category.

The respondents in urban areas (32%, n=211) were more likely to live alone than their rural counterparts (24%, n=41). Persons who lived alone were slightly older (mean age 75) than the persons who did not live alone (mean age 73). Table 8 shows that among the persons aged 62 to 74, just under one-quarter (23%, n=113) lived alone. In comparison, 38% (n=24) of the persons aged 85+ lived by themselves.

Married respondents were the least likely to live alone (1%, n=4). Divorced/separated persons lived alone in 73% (n=24) of the cases. Widowed persons lived alone in 69% (n=188) of the instances and single persons lived alone 60% (n=36) of the time. Refer to Table 9.

The satisfaction of the respondents with their housing was evaluated by asking the respondents to indicate if they felt their current residence was too large, too far from services, too far from family, too far from friends or too far from transportation. Table 10 shows that more than 80% of the respondents indicated that their housing did not fit into any of these categories. The complaint voiced most frequently by the respondents was the distance between their residence and their family (16%, n=132).

Plans to move in the future were indicated by five percent (n=45) of the respondents. The most common reasons given by the respondents for these plans were difficulty maintaining their residence (25%, n=10), the size of their residence (13%, n=5) and the expenses involved maintaining their residence (10%, n=4).

Among the respondents who indicated plans to move, 40% (n=17) said they were planing to move into a senior citizens' apartment building. Two percent (n=19) of the total sample said they were on a waiting list for a senior citizens' apartment.

3. INTEREST IN VARIOUS HOUSING OPTIONS

The possibility exists for all older persons who reside in their own homes that a time may come when they are unable to care for their own needs. If that time does come, the older persons may be faced with finding a suitable arrangement to meet their inpending requirements. In this survey the respondents were asked to project into the future and consider the type of housing that might interest them. The question was posed as such,..."If at a future point in your life you find it extremely difficult to take care of your own needs, please tell me if you would or would not be interested in the following housing arrangements"

- moving in with members of the family
- moving in with friends
- moving into a home for elderly persons
- staying home with friends to assist
- staying home with family to assist
- staying home with community services to assist
- moving into a housing project where some services are available.

The respondents interest in each of these options is indicated on Table 11.

The housing option for which the largest proportion of respondents (57%, n=469) expressed interest was remaining at home with the assistance of community services. The next two most popular options for which almost one-half of the respondents voiced interest were moving into a housing project where some services are available and moving into a home for elderly persons. The respondents showed least interest in moving in with friends (3%, n=24) and in moving in with family members (16%, n=135). Noteworthy is the finding that the most frequent "don't know" responses were with respect to moving into a home for elderly persons and moving into a housing project where some services were available.

The expression of interest in each of the housing options was examined in relation to differences relative to the respondents' age, sex, geographical location (rural/urban), income, marital status, living mates, present housing type, number of interfering health conditions, frequency of phone contact and visits with friends, number of children, number of activities with which assistance is received and number of requests for additional assistance.

For purposes of analysis, two housing options were combined and analyzed as one: moving into a home for elderly persons and moving into a housing project where some services were available (hereafter supportive housing arrangement). These two groups were combined upon theoretical consideration and upon an examination of the frequencies.

Interest in the first option, moving in with members of the family was expressed by sixteen percent (n=135) of the respondents. In the urban areas nineteen percent (n=113) indicated interest and in the rural areas thirteen percent (n=21) reported interest.

Table 12 shows that as the respondents increased in age, their interest in moving in with family also increased. Interest was expressed by fifteen percent (n=68) of persons aged 62 to 74 compared to 33% (n=17) of persons aged 85+.

The respondents with the higher incomes were less likely than persons with lower incomes to express an interest in moving in with family. Table 13 shows that interest was expressed by close to one-quarter (24%, n=44) of the persons whose monthly income fell below $600. compared to thirteen percent (n=40) of the persons whose monthly income exceeded $999.

The more frequently the respondents were visited by family members, the more likely they were to report an interest in moving in with them should they have difficulty living on their own. Table 14 shows that interest in moving in with family ranged from four percent (n=2) of persons who were visited less than once per year to 22% (n=77) of persons who were visited once or more per week.

The second option, moving in with friends, was considerably less attractive to the respondents than moving in with family, as a mere three percent (n=24) indicated an interest. Table 15 reveals that marital status was a distinguishing characteristic of persons who expressed an interest in this option. Least interest (2%, n=7) was expressed by those who were married and most interest was expressed by persons who were divorced/separated (15%, n=5).

The third option, moving into a home for elderly persons or moving into a housing project where some services were available (hereafter, Supportive Housing Arrangement) was regarded as attractive by 65% (n=547) of the respondents. Interest in this option was indicated by 73% (n=118) of the residents of rural areas compared to 68% (n=429) of the residents in urban areas. Those who had expressed interest were distinguished from those who did not, by their present housing type, age, marital status, and requests for additional assistance. Tables 16 through 19 reveal that the persons most likely to indicate an interest in moving into a supportive housing arrangement were apartment dwellers, those between the ages of 62 and 74, those who were single and those who had additional requests for assistance.

The fourth option, staying home with community services to assist, attracted the interest of the largest proportion (57%, n=469) of respondents. The persons who most frequently expressed interest in remaining at home with the assistance of community services resided in apartments (Table 20) had incomes of $800+ per month (Table 21), and indicated requests for additional assistance (Table 22).

The fifth and sixth options were, respectively, remaining at home with friends to assist and remaining at home with family members to assist. Thirty-six percent (n=299) of the respondents reported an interest in staying home with friends to assist and 44% (n=357) indicated an interest in having family assistance. No significant differences were found between rural and urban dwellers with respect to the interest voiced in receiving assistance from family. However, the expression of interest differed between persons in rural and urban communities regarding the interest in receiving assistance from friends. Persons in rural communities 43% (n=65) were more likely than persons in the urban communities (38%, n=228) to indicate an interest in receiving help from friends.

It is of interest to note that the respondents in the rural areas were visited by friends more frequently than the respondents in the urban areas. Seventy-five percent (n=126) of the respondents in the rural areas were visited by a friend at least once per month compared to 70% (n=474) of the respondents in the urban communities.

Irrespective of community, the respondents who were visited more frequently by friends were more likely than those who were visited less frequently to indicate an interest in receiving help from friends. Table 21 shows a twelve percent age point difference (42% compared to thirty percent) in the indication of interest expressed by persons who were visited at least once per month compared to those who were visited less often.

The respondents who voiced interest in remaining at home with family members to assist differed from those who were not interested by whether they lived alone, the frequency of phone contact they maintained with family and the frequency with which family visited them. The respondents most likely to voice an interest in receiving the assistance of family members while remaining at home lived alone (Table 22) had phone contact with family members every day (Table 23) and were visited by family one or more times per week (Table 24).

4. CONCLUSION

It can be predicted that many individuals will experience a decline in their health, their coping ability and their independence. This change may necessitate a change in the environment. Although changes that may be required may indeed be many, the number of available options may be few. The decision of older persons to remain at home or to move can be an important crossroad in their lives, a decision that can ultimately have a significant bearing on their quality of life.

The significance of the housing environment for older persons has been the subject of much gerontological research. The assumption underlying a great deal of this research is that as persons get older their ability to live independently is dependent upon environmental supports and access to services.

Many attempts have been made to evaluate the appropriate environment for individuals as they age and as their number of requirements increases (Kahana, 1975). The results of these attempts have demonstrated that this evaluation is by no means simple or straight forward. Ehrlich et al. (1982) suggest that in seeking to determine the most compatible environment for older persons:

> Knowledge of individual attitudes, behaviours and functional capacities alone is inadequate for such an assessment. An understanding of the functional interrelationships of the....(older person)....as they are expressed through involvement in sound support networks is essential to determine individual needs and environmental potential for maintaining congruence....(p.400).

In this paper efforts were made to assess the respondents' current housing situation and the type of accommodation that would be desired should it be difficult for them to remain within their own homes. To place these findings in context, it is worth considering the findings indicated in the report: Elderly Residents in Ontario: Social Contacts, Providers of Assistance and Requests for Additional Assistance.

This report indicates that 49% of the respondents received assistance with at least one activity. Sixty-five percent of the assistance was provided by family members, with the largest single provider being daughters (22%). Nine percent of the assistance came from neighbours/friends and three percent was provided by community agencies.

In spite of the fact that very few respondents currently received the assistance of community services, it is noteworthy, that the housing option for which the largest proportion (57%) of respondents indicated interest was remaining at home with the assistance of community services.

In order of popularity from most to least the housing options for which interest was expressed were:

- staying at home with the assistance of community services
- moving into a supportive housing arrangement
- staying home with family to assist
- staying home with friends to assist
- moving in with members of the family
- moving in with friends.

It is evident from these findings that reliance upon family members or friends, whether it be staying at home and receiving assistance from them, or moving in with them, was considered least desirable by the respondents. Therefore, even though family and friends were currently providing the bulk of assistance, the respondents, through their responses to these questions, indicated that should they require more assistance, they would prefer to receive the assistance from formal services rather than from their informal supports.

A comparison was made of the proportion of respondents who indicated an interest in the following housing options: remaining at home with community services or family/friends to assist, moving into a supportive housing arrangement, and moving in with family or friends. The proportion of persons who expressed interest in these options was

respectively 47%, 46% and fourteen percent. These findings suggest that although the most popular option was remaining at home with assistance, the interest in this option was only slightly larger than the interest expressed in moving into supportive housing. The difference between these groups, was negligible. Clearly the least popular housing option was moving into the home of a family member or a friend.

The findings in this study suggest the respondents' interest in various housing options and highlight the difference in preferences. The interest expressed varied from a low of three percent (moving in with friends) to a high of 57% (remaining at home with the assistance of community services).

The variety of interests revealed underline the necessity of having available alternative housing environments from which older persons can choose should they require assistance. Furthermore, the finding that demographic and contextual factors discriminate among groups in the expression of interest reinforces the significance of considering these factors in the planning process.

TABLE 1: AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSING TYPE

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

HOUSING TYPE	AGE GROUP					
	62 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
House	(373)	76	(178)	65	(44)	69
Apartment	(121)	24	(95)	35	(20)	31
TOTAL*	(494)	100	(273)	100	(64)	100

*5 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 12.66 $P < .01$

TABLE 2: SEX OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSING TYPE (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	SEX			
	Men		Women	
HOUSING TYPE	(N)	%	(N)	%
House	(277)	79	(312)	66
Apartment	(76)	21	(160)	34
TOTAL*	(353)	100	(472)	100

* 11 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 15.21 P < .01

TABLE 3: MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSING TYPE (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

HOUSING TYPE	MARITAL STATUS							
	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
House	(27)	45	(400)	86	(153)	57	(14)	42
Apartment	(33)	55	(67)	14	(118)	43	(19)	58
TOTAL*	(60)	100	(466)	100	(271)	100	(33)	100

Chi Square = 148.02 P < .01

*5 Missing Observations

TABLE 4: MONTHLY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY HOUSING TYPE (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MONTHLY INCOME							
	$000 - 599		600 - 799		800 - 999		1000+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
House	(130)	61	(84)	72	(107)	74	(242)	80
Apartment	(84)	39	(32)	28	(38)	26	(61)	20
TOTAL*	(214)	100	(116)	100	(145)	100	(303)	100

Chi Square = 32.42 P < .01

*58 Missing Observations

TABLE 5: MONTHLY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER THEY OWNED OR RENTED THEIR RESIDENCE

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MONTHLY INCOME									
	$000-599		$600-799		$800-999		$1000 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Owned	(108)	57	(81)	72	(103)	72	(240)	80	(532)	71
Rented	(80)	43	(31)	28	(41)	28	(62)	20	(241)	29
TOTAL*	(188)	100	(112)	100	(144)	100	(302)	100	(746)	100

*90 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 29.65 P <.01

TABLE 6: HOUSING TYPE AND OWNERSHIP OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER THEY LIVED ALONE, WITH A SPOUSE OR WITH OTHERS*

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

OWNERSHIP	LIVING MATES											
	Alone**				Spouse***				Others****			
	House		Apartment		House		Apartment		House		Apartment	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Own	(107)	99	(8)	6	(331)	96	(7)	12	(102)	92	(2)	9
Rent	(1)	1	(132)	94	(13)	4	(51)	88	(7)	6	(21)	91
TOTALS	(109)	100	(140)	100	(344)	100	(58)	100	(109)	100	(23)	100

Chi Square = 256.32 $P < .01$

**5 Missing Observations ***5 Missing Observations ****44 Missing Observations

* Others is defined as friends, family members, paid help or acquaintances. If the respondent is living with a spouse and one or more persons, he/she is included in the other category.

TABLE 7: TOTAL MONTHLY INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER THEY LIVED ALONE, WITH A SPOUSE OR WITH OTHERS*

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

MONTHLY INCOME	LIVING MATES							
	ALONE		SPOUSE		OTHERS		TOTAL	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
$000-599	(127)	53	(32)	8	(57)	37	(216)	28
$600-799	(40)	17	(53)	14	(23)	15	(116)	15
$800-999	(24)	10	(97)	25	(24)	16	(145)	19
$1000+	(47)	20	(206)	53	(50)	32	(303)	38
TOTAL**	(238)	100	(388)	100	(154)	100	(780)	100

**56 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 178.24 $P < .01$

* Others is defined as friends, family members, paid help or acquaintances. If the respondent is living with a spouse and one or more persons, he/she is included in the other category.

TABLE 8: AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER THEY LIVED ALONE OR WITH OTHERS

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	AGE GROUP					
	62 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Lives Alone	(113)	23	(114)	42	(24)	38
Lives With Others	(382)	77	(160)	58	(40)	62
TOTAL*	(495)	100	(274)	100	(64)	100

*3 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 31.33 $P < .01$

TABLE 9: MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY WHETHER THEY LIVED ALONE OR WITH OTHERS (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	MARITAL STATUS									
	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED		TOTAL	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Too Far From Services					(54)	6			(844)	100*
Too Far From Family			(705)	84	(132)	16			(837)	100**
Lives Alone	(36)	60	(4)	1	(188)	69	(24)	73		
Too Far From Friends			(778)	93	(61)	7			(839)	100***
Lives with Others	(24)	40	(463)	99	(85)	31	(9)	27	(842)	100****
TOTAL*	(60)	100	(467)	100	(273)	100	(33)	100		

* 2 Missing Observations
** 7 Missing Observations
*** 4 Missing Observations

*3 Missing Observations

TABLE 10: RESPONSES OF RESPONDENTS TO QUESTION: IS YOUR RESIDENCE.....

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	YES		NO		TOTAL	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Too Large	(82)	10	(761)	90	(844)	100*
Too Far From Services	(54)	6	(789)	94	(844)	100*
Too Far From Family	(132)	16	(705)	84	(837)	100**
Too Far From Friends	(61)	7	(778)	93	(839)	100***
Too Far From Transportation	(92)	11	(749)	89	(842)	100****

* 2 Missing Observations
** 9 Missing Observations
*** 7 Missing Observations
**** 4 Missing Observations

TABLE 11: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR EXPRESSED INTEREST IN VARIOUS TYPES OF HOUSING

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	INTEREST							
	INTERESTED		NOT INTERESTED		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Move in With Members of Family	(135)	16	(632)	76	(63)	8	(830)[a]	100
Move in With Friends	(24)	3	(773)	93	(32)	4	(829)[b]	100
Move into a Home for Elderly Persons	(378)	45	(367)	44	(88)	11	(833)[c]	100
Stay Home With Friends To Assist	(299)	36	(455)	56	(62)	8	(826)[d]	100
Stay Home With Family To Assist	(357)	44	(416)	51	(44)	5	(817)[e]	100
Stay Home With Community Services To Assist	(469)	57	(299)	36	(59)	7	(827)[f]	100
Move Into Housing Project Where Some Services Are Available	(391)	47	(355)	43	(82)	10	(828)[g]	100

[a] 14 Missing Observations
[b] 17 Missing Observations
[c] 13 Missing Observations
[d] 20 Missing Observations
[e] 29 Missing Observations
[f] 19 Missing Observations
[g] 18 Missing Observations

TABLE 2: AGE OF RESPONDENTS BY INTEREST EXPRESSED IN MOVING

EXPRESSED INTEREST IN VARIOUS TYPES OF HOUSING

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

	INTEREST									
	TOTAL INTEREST IN MOVING WITH FAMILY MEMBERS		DON'T KNOW (N)		NOT INTERESTED		AGE INTERESTED			
					62 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Move In With Members of Family	33	(149)	8	(63)	76	(639)	15	(68)	19	(149)
Move in With Friends	67	(300)	4	(32)	93	(386)	86	(101)	81	(181)
TOTAL*						(454)	100	(249)	100	(330)
Home for Elderly Persons	100	(833) [c]	11	(88)	44	(367)	45	(378)		
Stay Home With Friends To Assist	100	(826) [g]	8	(62)	56	(465)	36	(299)		
Stay Home With Family To Assist	100	(817) [e]	5	(44)	51	(416)	44	(357)		
Stay Home With Community Services To Assist	100	(827) [f]	7	(59)	36	(299)	57	(469)		
Move Into Housing Project Where Some Services Are Available	100	(828) [g]	10	(82)	43	(355)	47	(391)		

*92 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 11.32 P < .01

[a] 14 Missing Observations
[b] 17 Missing Observations
[c] 13 Missing Observations
[d] 20 Missing Observations
[e] 29 Missing Observations
[f] 19 Missing Observations
[g] 18 Missing Observations

TABLE 13: MONTHLY INCOME REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILY

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH FAMILY MEMBERS	INCOME							
	$000-599		$600-799		$800-999		$1,000+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(44)	24	(16)	16	(16)	13	(40)	13
Not Interested	(143)	76	(87)	84	(112)	87	(250)	87
TOTAL*	(187)	100	(103)	100	(128)	100	(290)	100

*128 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 9.85 $P < .05$

TABLE 14: FREQUENCY WITH WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE VISITED BY FAMILY MEMBERS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH MEMBERS OF THEIR FAMILY

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH FAMILY MEMBERS	FREQUENCY OF VISITS							
	1+ x/wk.		1-3 x/mo.		1-6 x/yr.		Less than 1 x/yr.	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(77)	22	(34)	17	(21)	14	(2)	4
Not Interested	(275)	78	(168)	83	(127)	86	(42)	96
TOTAL*	(352)	100	(202)	100	(148)	100	(44)	100

*90 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 10.63 $P < .05$

TABLE 15: MARITAL STATUS OF THE RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH FRIENDS (NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING IN WITH FRIENDS	MARITAL STATUS							
	SINGLE		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED/ SEPARATED	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(6)	11	(7)	2	(8)	3	(5)	15
Not Interested	(47)	89	(436)	99	(248)	97	(28)	85
TOTAL*	(53)	100	(442)	100	(256)	100	(33)	100

*51 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 21.37 P < .01

TABLE 16: PRESENT HOUSING TYPE OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING INTO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING INTO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT	HOUSING TYPE			
	HOUSE		APARTMENT	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(377)	66	(165)	76
Not Interested	(190)	34	(52)	24
TOTAL*	(567)	100	(217)	100

*52 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 6.26 $P < .01$

TABLE 17: AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS BY INTEREST IN MOVING INTO A SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING INTO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT	AGE					
	62 - 74		75 - 84		85+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(339)	72	(176)	67	(30)	53
Not Interested	(134)	28	(85)	33	(27)	47
TOTAL*	(473)	100	(261)	100	(57)	100

*45 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 8.99 P =.01

TABLE 18: MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING INTO A SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING INTO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT	MARITAL STATUS							
	Single		Married		Widowed		Divorced/ Separated	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(43)	77	(315)	71	(168)	65	(18)	55
Not Interested	(13)	23	(129)	29	(90)	35	(15)	45
TOTAL*	(56)	100	(444)	100	(258)	100	(33)	100

*45 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 7.37 $P < .05$

TABLE 19: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE OF THE RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN MOVING INTO A SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN MOVING INTO SUPPORTIVE HOUSING ARRANGEMENT	NO REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE		REQUESTS MADE FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(161)	63	(99)	73
Not Interested	(96)	37	(36)	27
TOTAL*	(257)	100	(135)	100

*22 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 4.06 $P < .05$

TABLE 20: HOUSING TYPE OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST	HOUSING TYPE			
	House		Apartment	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(311)	58	(150)	71
Not Interested	(226)	42	(61)	29
TOTAL*	(537)	100	(211)	100

*88 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 10.57 $P < .01$

TABLE 21: INCOME OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING AT HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST	MONTHLY INCOME					
	$000 - 599		$600 - 799		$800+	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(108)	56	(59)	56	(270)	65
Not Interested	(84)	44	(47)	44	(145)	35
TOTAL*	(192)	100	(106)	100	(415)	100

*123 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 7.70 P = .05

TABLE 22: REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH COMMUNITY SERVICES TO ASSIST	NO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE (N)	%	REQUESTS MADE FOR ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE (N)	%
Interested	(339)	58	(130)	69
Not Interested	(241)	42	(58)	31
TOTAL*	(580)	100	(188)	100

*78 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 6.39 $P < .05$

TABLE 23: FREQUENCY WITH WHICH RESPONDENTS WERE VISITED BY FRIENDS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FRIENDS TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FRIENDS TO ASSIST	FREQUENCY OF VISITS FROM FRIENDS			
	At Least One Per Month		Less Than One Per Month	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(229)	42	(64)	30
Not Interested	(312)	58	(146)	70
TOTAL*	(541)	100	(210)	100

*85 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 8.44 $P < .01$

TABLE 24: LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF RESPONDENTS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST	Lives Alone (N)	Lives Alone %	Lives With Others (N)	Lives With Others %
Interested	(92)	40	(261)	49
Not Interested	(136)	60	(276)	51
TOTAL*	(228)	100	(537)	100

*71 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 4.06 $P < .05$

TABLE 25: FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS' PHONE CONTACT WITH FAMILY MEMBERS BY THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST	FREQUENCY OF PHONE CONTACT							
	Every Day		1-6 x/wk.		1-3x/mo.		Less Than 1x/mo.	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(131)	55	(166)	46	(36)	38	(18)	33
Not Interested	(109)	45	(193)	54	(60)	62	(37)	67
TOTAL*	(240)	100	(359)	100	(96)	100	(55)	100

*86 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 13.59 $P < .01$

TABLE 26: FREQUENCY OF THE RESPONDENTS' VISITS FROM FAMILY MEMBERS OF THEIR INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST

(NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE)

INTEREST IN STAYING HOME WITH FAMILY MEMBERS TO ASSIST	FREQUENCY OF VISITS FROM FAMILY MEMBERS							
	1 x/wk.		1-3x/mo.		1-6x/mo.		Less Than Once A Year	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Interested	(195)	55	(91)	43	(59)	40	(7)	17
Not Interested	(163)	45	(118)	57	(88)	60	(33)	83
TOTAL*	(358)	100	(209)	100	(147)	100	(40)	100

*82 Missing Observations

Chi Square = 25.76 $P < .01$

APPENDIX

OTHER PAPERS IN USCO SERIES

The data which was gathered in the USCO survey provides base line information on the living situation of senior citizens who are not living in institutions in the province of Ontario. The volume and comprehensiveness of the data demanded separate analysis to allow for clear and complete information regarding the association between variables. A series of papers resulted with each paper having a particular emphasis.

Within the series, seven papers are issue oriented:

1. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Health Status and Use of the Health Care System.
2. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Social Contacts, Providers of Assistance and Requests for Additional Assistance.
3. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Participation as Volunteers and Their Interest in Volunteerism.
4. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Use of Transportation.
5. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Potential and Actual Use of Community Services.
6. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Current Housing Situation and Their Interest in Various Housing Options.
7. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Their Participation in Leisure Activities and The arriers to Their Participation.

Six papers provide profiles of subgroups within the population surveyed:

8. Elderly Residents in Ontario: The Experience of Those Who are Childless.
9. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Age Differences With Particular Focus on Persons Aged 85+.
10. Elderly Residents in Ontario: The Experiences of Those Who Are Frail.
11. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Marital Differences With Particular Focus on Those Who Are Single.

12. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Income Group Differences.

13. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Rural-Urban Differences.

The series also includes:

14. Elderly Residents in Ontario: Study Methodology: a paper outlining the background of the study and the research methods employed.

15. Elderly Residents in Ontario: An Overview: a paper summarizing the findings and content of the other fourteen papers in the series.

The intention is that each of the fifteen papers in the series can be studied on its own but, also that the complete series will offer continuity and comprehensive information in an accessible form.

Additional copies of this report, and others in the series, are available in person from the Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario;

or, by mail through contacting:

Publications Services
5th Floor, 880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

In Ontario call toll free 1-800-268-7540; or, from area code 807 ask the Operator for Zenith 6-7200.

APPENDIX

GLOSSARY

Chi Square: a test of statistical significance which is used to determine whether variables are independent or related and to also determine the extent to which the relationship is systematic and is not just occuring by chance.

Cleaning: a method by which the data is systematically examined to identify and eliminate inappropriate codes and wild punches (key punching errors).

Coding: a method of transforming information from the interview schedule into a numerical scheme for purposes of data analysis. The codes are subsequently key punched onto a computer card and fed into the computer for analysis.

Community Agency/ Service: all health, social, legal and financial services available in a community and organized under public or voluntary auspices. The services may operate with or without paid staff, and may or may not charge the user for services rendered.

Cross Tabulations: a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables. The cross tabulations allow for statistical analysis using a test of significance such as the chi-square test.

Data: the information gathered in the study. In this project it consists of information gathered from the 846 interviews.

Dependent Variable: the outcome or determined condition in a relationship between two or more variables.

Disability: the requirement for assistance or the inability to carry out activities related to day to day living (i.e., housework, meal preparation.)

Frail: reports of three or more disabilities was the basis for defining a person as frail.

Frequencies: descriptive statistics used to organize data. The information is divided into variable categories or intervals and the number of cases in each category is known as the 'frequency' for that variable. The relative frequency is calculated by computing the percentage represented by the number of cases in each variable category.

Friendly Visiting: a community service wherein the individual receives personal visits from another person. This service may be organized under public or voluntary auspices and its purpose is to provide seniors with friendly contact.

G.I.S.: Guaranteed Income Supplement - a federal government supplement given to seniors to ensure that their income is at a specified level.

GAINS-A: Ontario provincial income supplement for senior citizens.

Health Care System: family physicians, specialists, hospitalizations, nursing home or rehabilitation centres.

Home Care: a program of visiting health care services to people in their own homes who meet eligibility criteria as established by the Ontario Ministry of Health.

Independent Variables: the determining condition in a relationship of two or more variables.

Institutional Settings: nursing homes, homes for the aged, chronic care units in general hospitals or chronic care hospitals, special care facilities and mental health facilities.

Instrument: the tool used to gather data; in this case the tool was an interview schedule.

Interfering Health Conditions: health conditions identified by a physician which the respondents consider to interfere with their day to day activities.

Interview Schedule: the questionnaire used by the interviewer to ask questions and record information.

Leisure Activity: an activity which a person participates in by choice and of their own volition; includes recreational activities, hobbies, volunteer work, etc.

Mean ($\bar{X}$): the sum of all the observations divided by the number of observations.

Missing Observations: instances in which the information is not available for a particular question.

Multiple Response: a procedure done on the computer with the use of SPSS whereby a analysis can be done of questions to which the respondents might legitimately make more than one reply.

OARS ADL Scale: specific questions developed for OARS (Older American Resources and Service Program of the Duke University Centre for the Study of Aging and Human Development). The ADL Scale measures the ability of respondents to carry out the activities of daily living (ADLS), (i.e., use of the telephone and meal preparation).

Old Age Security Data Base: a complete listing of all persons aged 62+ who receive the Old Age Security Pension and the Spouse's Allowance.

Paid Help: distinguished from a community service in that it is assistance received which is not organized under public auspices as a service. It is all other assistance for which a fee is paid.

Personal Care Activities: activities such as bathing, dressing and getting in and out of bed.

Pretest: the testing of a research instrument such as a questionnaire or interview schedule prior to actually administering it for a study. The purpose of a pretest is to see how the instrument actually works in the field. The extent to which the questions are understood and the ease with which the instrument is administered is examined.

Previously Married: individuals who were married but are not presently married due to being widowed, divorced or separated.

Random Sample: a process for sample selection in which every element in the population is given an equal chance of being picked.

Represenativeness: the degree to which the study sample represents the population at large. Specific characteristics such as sex and age can be compared to determine the representativeness.

S.D.: a statistic which measures the scatter of a set of data and indicates the extent to which the responses vary around the mean.

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences is a system of computer programs for the purpose of data analysis.

Sample: part of the population at large, selected for study.

Sample Frame: the base from which a sample is drawn, i.e., list of names.

Significant Differences: determined through a statistical procedure to establish that the relationship between variables did not occur by chance.

Single: persons who have never been married or are not living common-law.

Social Contacts: visits with friends and family or in person.

Socio-Economic: characteristics frequently used to measure social status such as educational level or income.

Stratified Sample: a sample procedure whereby all individuals are divided into groups or categories (in the case of this study it was communities) and then an independent sample is selected within each group or stratum.)

Supportive Housing Arrangements: a housing arrangement in which some supportive services are available, such as meals, house cleaning.

Tau: Kendal's Tau: a statistic used to measure the association among ordinal data. It summarizes the relationship between variables.

Variable: refers to a particular characteristic of the sample being considered.

Volunteer: a person who gives his/her time to a particular cause or organization without pay.

REFERENCES

Ehrlich, Phyllis, Ehrlich, Ira and Woehlke, Paula. "Congregate Housing For The Elderly", The Gerontologist, Vol. 22, 4 (August, 1982) pp. 399-403

Kahana, E., "A Congruence Model of Person-Environment Interaction" in P. Wendley and G. Ernst (Eds.) Theory Development in Environment and Aging. Washington, D.C.: Gerontological Society, 1975.